# ORIGINAL



## BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

25 H

3

4

5

6

7

1

2 **COMMISSIONERS** 

JEFF HATCH-MILLER, Chairman WILLIAM A. MUNDELL MARC SPITZER

AGAINST UNISOURCE ENERGY

UNS ELECTRIC, INC. FOR AN ORDER

A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND

NECESSITY FROM MOHAVE ELECTRIC

MIKE GLEASON KRISTIN K. MAYES

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF MOHAVE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

COOPERATIVE, INC.

CORPORATION AND UNS ELECTRIC, INC.1 8

10 11

9

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

2005 FEB 18 A 10: 09

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

FEB 1 8 2005

**DOCKETED BY** 

DOCKET NO. E-01750A-04-0798 DOCKET NO. E-04204A-04-0798

DOCKET NO. E-04230A-04-0798 ★

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF APPROVING A TRANSFER OF A PORTION OF DOCKET NO. E-01750A-04-0824 DOCKET NO. E-04204A-04-0824

#### PROCEDURAL ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

On November 5, 2004, Mohave Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Mohave") filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") a Complaint against UniSource Energy Corporation ("UniSource") alleging, among other things, that UniSource has improperly refused to provide wholesale service to Mohave under an Open Access Transmission Tariff, and that UniSource has refused to negotiate in good faith a system-wide border area agreement with Mohave. The Complaint was prompted by a request for service from Central Trucking, Inc. ("CTI") which plans to construct a building to conduct business in Mohave's certificated service area.

On November 15, 2004, UNS Electric, Inc. ("UNS") filed with the Commission an application seeking to have territory that was previously within the certificated service territory of UNS' predecessor, Citizens Utilities Company ("Citizens"), "revert" to UNS. Mohave currently holds the Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CC&N") for the territory that is in dispute, and

On January 3, 2005, Mohave Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Mohave") filed a Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint in order to add UNS Electric, Inc. as a respondent to the Complaint. Mohave's Motion was granted at the February 16, 2005 Procedural Conference and the revised caption reflects the addition of UNS Electric, Inc. as a named respondent. The above-captioned dockets were also formally consolidated at the February 16, 2005 Procedural Conference for purposes of hearing. The revised captions now reflect the correct description of these consolidated dockets that should be used for all subsequent filings in this matter.

in which CTI's property is located, pursuant to Decision No. 58798 (October 14, 1994)<sup>2</sup>. UNS concedes that the disputed territory is currently within Mohave's CC&N area, but contends that Mohave was granted the portion of the service area in question solely for the purpose of serving a specific customer, North Star Steel Company ("North Star"), which is no longer in business. UNS argues that because the disputed area was previously served by Citizens, and North Star is no longer in business, the CC&N area in which CTI is located should revert to UNS as Citizens' successor in interest.

On January 31, 2005, the Commission issued an Emergency Order for Provision of Electric Service ("Emergency Order") (Decision No. 67535). In the Emergency Order, the Commission directed UNS to immediately provision electric service to CTI, on an interim basis, until the issues raised in these dockets have been resolved. Decision No. 67535 made clear that the provision of interim service by UNS would not prejudice any claims or arguments that either UNS or Mohave may have in the pending cases.

### **Motion to Dismiss**

On November 29, 2004, UNS filed an Answer to the Complaint and Motion for Dismissal. UNS denied the material allegations in the Complaint and argued that the Complaint should be dismissed because Mohave is attempting to have the Commission approve a new rate outside of a rate case, and because borderline agreements should be established on a case-by-case basis to accommodate specific customer situations.

Mohave filed a Response to UNS' Motion for Dismissal on January 3, 2005. Mohave contends that a system-wide borderline agreement would provide uniform guidelines between the two companies upon a showing that such an agreement is in the public interest. Mohave also argues that its Complaint does not seek a rate increase but is instead asking for authority to recover any increased costs associated with serving a single customer through a specific surcharge mechanism. Mohave claims that the Commission has jurisdiction to hear and resolve the allegations raised in the Complaint and requests that the Motion for Dismissal be denied.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In Decision No. 58798, the Commission transferred the portion of Citizens' CC&N to Mohave described in that Order and stated that the transferred CC&N area "shall not revert to Citizens Utilities Company under any circumstances without prior Commission approval" (*Id.* at 6).

The Motion for Dismissal filed by UNS is denied. Mohave's Complaint and UNS' application raise issues of both fact and law that are best addressed through a full hearing on the merits of each party's claims. As discussed at the February 16, 2005 Procedural Conference, Mohave's allegations are inter-related with the relief sought by UNS in its application and, given the administrative nature of the proceedings, it is entirely appropriate to allow the parties to present their respective cases before a determination is made regarding each party's arguments. Under the facts and circumstances presented herein, due process is best served by allowing a full airing of the issues as opposed to precluding one party from presenting evidence in support of its claims.

#### **Procedural Schedule**

By Procedural Order issued February 3, 2005, a Procedural Conference was scheduled for February 16, 2005 to discuss scheduling of discovery, testimony, and hearing dates.

The Procedural Conference was held on February 16, 2005 as scheduled. During the conference, the parties agreed to the procedural schedule that is incorporated in the following ordering paragraphs.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the hearing in the above-captioned matter shall commence on **August 2**, **2005**, **at 10:00 a.m.**, or as soon thereafter as is practical, at the Commission's offices, 1200 West Washington Street, Arizona 85007.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a pre-hearing conference shall be held on July 25, 2005, at 1:30 p.m., at the Commission's offices, for the purpose of scheduling witnesses and the conduct of the hearing.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Staff Report and/or any direct testimony and associated exhibits to be presented at hearing on behalf of Staff shall be reduced to writing and filed on or before April 18, 2005.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any direct testimony and associated exhibits to be presented at hearing on behalf of Mohave, UNS, and any intervenors shall be reduced to writing and filed on or before June 6, 2005.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any rebuttal testimony and associated exhibits to be presented at hearing by all parties shall be reduced to writing and filed on or before July 11, 2005.

> 3 4

6

5

8

9

7

10 11

12 13

15 16

14

17 18

20

21

19

22

24

23

25 26

27

"Days" means calendar days. 28

The parties are encouraged to attempt to settle discovery disputes through informal, good-faith negotiations before seeking Commission resolution of the controversy.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all filings shall be made by 4:00 p.m. on the date the filing is due, unless otherwise indicated.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any objections to any testimony or exhibits which have been prefiled as of July 11, 2005, shall be made before or at the July 25, 2005 pre-hearing conference.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that intervention shall be in accordance with A.A.C. R14-3-105, except that all motions to intervene must be filed on or before May 16, 2005.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that discovery shall be as permitted by law and the rules and regulations of the Commission, except that: any objection to discovery requests shall be made within 7 days<sup>3</sup> of receipt and responses to discovery requests shall be made within 10 days of receipt; the response time may be extended by mutual agreement of the parties involved if the request requires an extensive compilation effort.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in the alternative to filing a written motion to compel discovery, any party seeking discovery may telephonically contact the Commission's Hearing Division to request a date for a procedural hearing to resolve the discovery dispute; that upon such a request, a procedural hearing will be convened as soon as practicable; and that the party making such a request shall contact all other parties to advise them of the hearing date and shall at the procedural hearing provide a statement confirming that the other parties were contacted.<sup>4</sup>

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any motions filed in this matter that are not ruled upon by the Commission within 10 days of the filing date of the motion shall be deemed denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any responses to motions shall be filed within five days of the filing date of the motion.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any replies shall be filed within five days of the filing date of the response.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Mohave and UNS shall share the costs of providing public notice of the hearing in this matter, by publishing the notice in a newspaper of general circulation in Mohave County, in the following form and style, with the heading in no less than 18 point bold type and the body in no less than 10 point regular type:

3

4

5

1

PUBLIC NOTICE OF CONSOLIDATED HEARING ON THE COMPLAINT OF MOHAVE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. AGAINST UNISOURCE ENERGY CORPORATION AND UNS ELECTRIC, INC. (DOCKET NO. E-01750A-04-0798 et al.) AND APPLICATION OF UNS ELECTRIC, INC. FOR AN ORDER APPROVING A TRANSFER OF A PORTION OF A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FROM MOHAVE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. (DOCKET NO. E-01750A-04-0824 et al.)

67

8

9

10

11

On November 5, 2004, Mohave Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Mohave") filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") a Complaint against UniSource Energy Corporation and UNS Electric, Inc. ("UNS") alleging, among other things, that UNS has improperly refused to provide wholesale service to Mohave under an Open Access Transmission Tariff, and that UNS has refused to negotiate in good faith a system-wide border area agreement with Mohave. The Complaint was prompted by a request for service from Central Trucking, Inc. ("CTI") which plans to construct a building to conduct business in Mohave's certificated service area.

12 13

14

15

16

17

On November 15, 2004, UNS filed with the Commission an application seeking to have territory that was previously within the certificated service territory of UNS' predecessor, Citizens Utilities Company ("Citizens"), "revert" to UNS. Mohave currently holds the Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CC&N") for the territory that is in dispute, and in which CTI's property is located, pursuant to Decision No. 58798 (October 14, 1994). UNS contends that Mohave was granted the portion of the service area in question solely for the purpose of serving a specific customer, North Star Steel Company, which is no longer in business. UNS claims that because the disputed area was previously served by Citizens, and North Star is no longer in business, the CC&N area in which CTI is located should revert to UNS as Citizens' successor in interest.

18

19

20

21

On January 31, 2005, the Commission issued an Emergency Order for Provision of Electric Service ("Emergency Order") (Decision No. 67535). In the Emergency Order, the Commission directed UNS to immediately provision electric service to CTI, on an interim basis, until the issues raised in these dockets have been resolved.

2223

24

25

The Commission will hold a hearing on this matter beginning August 2, 2005, at 10:00 a.m., at the Commission's offices, 1200 West Washington, Phoenix, Arizona. Public comments will be taken on the first day of the hearing. Written public comments submitted may be via e-mail (visit http://www.cc.state.az.us/utility/cons/index.htm for instructions), or by mailing a letter referencing Docket No. E-04230A-04-0798 et al. to: Arizona Corporation Commission, Consumer Services Section, 1200 West Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007. If you have any questions about this application, you may also contact the Consumer Services Section of the Commission by calling 1-800-222-7000.

26

The law provides for an open public hearing at which, under appropriate circumstances, interested parties may intervene. Intervention shall be permitted to

2728

any person entitled by law to intervene and having a direct and substantial interest in the matter. Persons desiring to intervene must file a written motion to intervene with the Commission, which motion must be sent to all parties of record, and must contain the following:

- 1. The name, address, and telephone number of the proposed intervenor and of any party upon whom service of documents is to be made if different from the intervenor.
- 2. A short statement of the proposed intervenor's interest in the proceeding (e.g., a customer, a shareholder, etc.).
- 3. A statement certifying that a copy of the motion to intervene has been mailed to all parties of record in the case.

The granting of intervention, among other things, entitles a party to present sworn evidence at the hearing and to cross-examine other witnesses. The granting of motions to intervene shall be governed by A.A.C. R14-13-105, except that all motions to intervene must be filed on or before May 16, 2005. For information about requesting intervention, visit the Arizona Corporation Commission's webpage at <a href="http://www.cc.state.az.us/utility/cons/index.htm">http://www.cc.state.az.us/utility/cons/index.htm</a>. However, <a href="failure to intervene will not preclude any interested person or entity from appearing at the hearing and providing public comment on the application or from filing written comments in the record of the case.

The Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admission to its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, as well as request this document in an alternative format, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Linda Hogan, at <a href="LHogan@admin.cc.state.az.us">LHogan@admin.cc.state.az.us</a>, voice phone number 602/542-3931. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the notice described above shall be published by no later than April 18, 2005 and proof of publication shall be filed by no later than May 16, 2005.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Ex Parte Rule (A.A.C. R14-3-113 - Unauthorized Communications) applies to this proceeding as the matter is now set for public hearing.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all parties must comply with Rule 33 (c) and (d) of the Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court with respect to practice of law and admission pro hac vice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that withdrawal of representation must be made in compliance with A.A.C. R14-3-104(E) and Rule 1.16 of the Rules of Professional Conduct (under Rule 42 of the Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court). Representation before the Commission includes the obligation to appear at all hearings and procedural conferences, as well as all Open Meetings for which the matter is scheduled for discussion, unless counsel has previously been granted permission to withdraw by the Administrative Law Judge.

1	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge may rescind, alter, amend,	
2	or waive any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by ruling at	
3	hearing.	
4	Dated this day of February, 2005	
5		
6	' M	and a
7	DWIGHT D	NODES T CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
8	ABSISTAIT	CHEF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JODGE
9	The foregoing was mailed/delivered this day of February, 2005 to:	
11	Michael A. Curtis William P. Sullivan	Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel Legal Division
12	CURTIS, GOODWIN, SULLIVAN, UDALL & SCHWAB, P.L.C.	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street
13	2712 North Seventh Street Phoenix, AZ 85006-1090	Phoenix, AZ 85007
14	Thomas H. Campbell	Ernest G. Johnson, Director Utilities Division
15	LEWIS & ROCA LLP 40 N. Central Avenue	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street
16	Phoenix, AZ 85004	Phoenix, AZ 85007
17	Michelle Livengood Legal Department Tucson Electric Power Company	ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE 2627 N. Third Street, Ste. Three Phoenix, AZ 85004-1003
18	One South Church Avenue P.O. Box 711	1 HOCHIX, AZ 65004-1005
19	Tucson, AZ 85702-3664 Attorneys for UNS Electric, Inc.	By: Molly Johnson
20	Terrence G. O'Hara	Secretary to Dwight D. Nodes
21	Central Trucking, Inc. 11930 N. Hartman Dr.	
22	Edinburgh, IN 46124	
23		
25		
26		
27		